## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated September 26, 2003 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the specification, drawings, and claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-6 have been amended and claims 1-7 are presently pending and presented for consideration.

According to the Office Action, Fig. 1 should be designated by the legend -- Prior Art--. Fig. 1 has been amended to include the legend -- Prior Art --.

The drawings are objected to because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description, line 161-164: 262, 263, 264 and 265. The specification has been amended to correspond with amended Fig. 2.

The drawings are objected to for failing to use descriptive language along each reference numeral to identify each element of the drawing. Figs. 1-3 have been amended to overcome this objection.

The Office Action pointed out that page 3, line 80 refers to element "201" as "directional coupler". However, Fig. 2 shows element "201" pointing at a feedback line. The specification has been amended to correspond with the drawing.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "371" has been used to designate both an IFFT and an amplifier. Fig. 3 has been amended to overcome this objection.

The disclosure of the specification is objected to because of informalities. The specification has been amended to overcome this objection.

Claims 1-7 are objected to because of informalities in claims 1-7. Claims 1-7 have been amended to overcome these objections.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action states that the limitation "alpha, epsilon and gain" is not defined. Claims 1, 2 and 5 are amended to define alpha, epsilon and gain as imbalance parameters. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action states that the limitation "first alpha, first epsilon and first gain" and "second alpha, second epsilon and second gain" are not defined. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3 and 6 recite "calculating the first alpha, first epsilon, and first gain based on the energy of the at least four transmitted symbols." Claims 3 and 6 also recite "calculating the second alpha, the second epsilon and the second gain based on the energy of the next data symbol." Thus, Applicant submits that these claims define how the first and second alpha, the first and second epsilon, and the first and second gain are to be determined/calculated. Applicant therefore requests that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

The Office Action stated that claims 1-7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-7

have been amended to overcome the objections and rejections in the Office Action. It is

therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-7 be allowed and this application

passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in

condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by

telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to

arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions

for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any

additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

Mene & Wood

Registration No. 43,828

Customer No. 32294

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP

14<sup>TH</sup> Floor

8000 Towers Crescent Drive

Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700

Telephone: 703-720-7800

Fax: 703-720-7802

APN:lls

Enclosures: Replacement Drawings